

February 20, 1975

county assessors single out and make the administrative determination as to whether or not this is an eligible structure. I would think that they would make that on the basis of if there was one family who was using this structure, which has been improved, for its residence . . . for the residence of the family. It is not designed to include . . . or make eligibility premised upon location in a certain area. I think it would be unworkable. I think it is workable to define the structure itself.

SENATOR WARNER: Could I ask one other question? I'm only asking these because I can see where there could be a problem at some point in implementation if the language is other than you think. Will you run into a problem of definition as to what will constitute a single-family dwelling from the standpoint that you could have a family and they could have a nephew living with them for a reason, which is then . . . or maybe a foreign student, or what have you . . . a foster home, that may not constitute a part of the . . . as a family dwelling unit? Or do you think the language is sufficiently broad that that would not be restrictive?

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: I think that the language of the amendment is sufficiently broad. I would expect that the Legislature would have the power to define that. I would anticipate the Legislature defining single-family to include probably grandparents, or the situation of any other individual . . . a foster child, or a foreign student, who is participating in the family structure rather than participating in the dwelling place as a renter or some other relationship other than a cooperative relationship within the family. I think it's broad enough language to include these kind of situations. I don't think you would immediately become ineligible because you took a foreign student into your home for the exemption.

SENATOR SAVAGE: The Chair recognizes Senator Syas then Senator Murphy.

SENATOR SYAS: Well I just wanted to make a brief statement. Two things. I think we're getting off the track here a little bit. I think we should adopt the amendment then debate the bill. It seems to me what we're doing right now, we're debating the bill. The amendment is offered. Drop the amendment, then debate the bill. I would say to this . . . to the senate since the Legislature has the option . . . and all I can . . . about making the bill after the constitutional amendment passes, if it does, I might say this so I won't have to get up again, historically this Legislature has done the following: they have reimbursed, out of state funds for the tax loss, property tax loss to the subdivision that lost it. Now that's exactly what they've done in the past. I don't know if they'll do it this time or not. But historically that's what we have done. We're doing it now in lieu of the tax on the intangibles. Homestead exemption, just to name a couple. There's a few more. Therefore, if we did this same thing, the question is the Legislature would reimburse out of state funds the losses that any subdivision would lose on the property tax because of this bill. That all has to come about at the time we enact the bill, after the constitutional amendment passes, if it does. I didn't want to get up again so I figured I'd give you the whole load now.